



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/700,821	11/20/2000	Mark Joseph Burk	GJE-230A	2854
109	7590	01/29/2004	EXAMINER	
THE DOW CHEMICAL COMPANY INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY SECTION P. O. BOX 1967 MIDLAND, MI 48641-1967			LAVILLA, MICHAEL E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1775	

DATE MAILED: 01/29/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/700,821

Applicant(s)

BURK ET AL.

Examiner

Michael La Villa

Art Unit

1775

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4. 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 1775

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
2. The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
3. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
4. Regarding Claims 1 and 12, it is unclear what the claimed formula represents. The catalyst is described as comprising a "cationic rhodium(I) complex" of the given formula. However, the claimed formula does not include rhodium or an indication of charge. Hence, it is unclear what is the claimed complex. It is unclear whether the claimed formula demands that the combination R1/R2 bonded to one phosphorus is to be the same as the combination R1/R2 bonded to the other phosphorus atom. In view of the comma punctuation, it is unclear how many elements are claimed. Should a comma immediately follow the formula and the comma preceding the word "or" be deleted?
5. Regarding Claim 6, it is unclear whether Markush group language of the form "selected from the group consisting of" was intended.
6. Regarding Claim 7, it is unclear what is the antecedent basis of the phrase "metal oxide."

Art Unit: 1775

7. Regarding Claim 13, it is unclear what is the antecedent basis of the phrase "substrate conversion." It is unclear what is meant by the reference to "also."
- With respect to what else is the sulfide group to be in addition?

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
9. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
10. Claims 1-7 and 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burk et al. in "Efficient Rhodium-Catalyzed Hydrogenation of Aldehydes and Ketones" in view of Tanielyan et al. WO 98/20874. Burk et al. teaches using rhodium(I) complexes of the claimed formula in order to hydrogenate aldehydes to alcohols. See Burk (pages 4963 and 4964). Burk does not exemplify the claimed anionic support materials. Tanielyan teaches that homogeneous catalyst systems may be implemented on anionic support materials in order to

Art Unit: 1775

effect heterogeneous systems which offer beneficial reaction recovery properties. See Tanielyan et al. (page 2, lines 19-30; page 7, lines 5-26; page 11, lines 19-27; page 12, line 28 through page 13, line 25; and page 36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the catalyst system of Burk on the supports of Tanielyan in order to provide for a beneficial heterogeneous catalyst system. Burk may not exemplify using a sulfide containing aldehyde, but does teach one that may be hydrogenated. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to hydrogenate the sulfide containing aldehyde of Burk using the catalyst of Burk since Burk teaches that effective hydrogenation would result.

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claims 8, 9, and 14 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Neither the reviewed prior art nor the prior art of record teaches or suggests the subject matter of Claims 8, 9 and 14. Particularly, the sulfonic acid group containing resins of Claims 8 and 9 are not taught or suggested. As well, carrying out the process in a water/alcohol mixture is not taught or suggested.

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael La Villa whose telephone number is

Art Unit: 1775

(571) 272-1539. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

13. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Deborah Jones can be reached on (571) 272-1535. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Michael La Villa
January 25, 2004

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'La Villa', written in a cursive style.